# 1AC – Life Form:

## Framework:

#### Ethics must justify an action theory, or a way to understand action coherently. Action and ethics can only be conceived in terms of what makes it good for the agent, as the only thing that distinguishes action from causal influences is an account of what makes the action “good” for the agent. MACINTYRE 1:

MacIntyre, Alasdair.“Notes from the Moral Wilderness” I and II, *New Reasoner* 7 (Winter 1958–1959): 90–100

Men make their own history, but ... " This phrase echoes through - the Marxist classics. The political aim of Marxists is to liquidate that ' but'. Their theoretical aim is to understand it. In order to understand it we must first be clear what it is for men to make their own history, for men to act and not just to suffer. So the concept of human action is central to our enquiry. What is it to understand any given piece of behaviour as a human action? Consider the following example. If my head nods, it may be a sign of [approval] assent to a question or it may be a nervous tick. To explain the nod as a way of saying ' Yes' to a question is to give it a role in the context of human action. To explain [it] the nod as a nervous tick is to assert that the nod was not an action but something that happened to me [as opposed to intentional action]. To understand the nod as a nervous tick we turn to the neurophysiologist for a causal explanation. To understand it as a sign of assent is to move in a different direction. It is to ask for a statement of the purpose that my saying Yes served; it is to ask for reasons, not for causes and it is to ask for reasons which point to a recognisable want or need served by my action. This reference to purpose is important. When social anthropologists come across some unintelligible mode of behaviour, obedience to a primitive taboo, for example, they look for some as yet unnoticed purpose, some want or need to which such obedience ministers; and if they find none they look for some past want or need which the practice once served, even though now it is nothing but a useless survival. That is to say, we make both individual deeds and social practices intelligible as human actions by showing how they connect with characteristically human desires, needs and the like. Where we cannot do this, we treat the unintelligible piece of behaviour as a symptom, a survival or superstition.

#### And, the intelligibility of sequences of actions is prior to what constitutes a single action – consequence based theories are incoherent. MACINTYRE 2:

Alasdair MacIntyre, “The Intelligibility of Action” (1986)

I smile in a friendly way at someone at a party. He responds by saying “Have we met somewhere before?” My opponent at chess takes my queen. I say "I might as well resign. Do you want another game or shall we go for a walk?" We go for a walk. A cook tastes his fish stew and says “A little more pepper, perhaps. What do you think?” His friend takes the spoon, tastes [it] the stew and nods. In each case the response is an intelligible sequel to the immediately prior action or actions and as such presupposes an interpretation of that [the] behavior to which it is a respon[d]se [to] as an action of such and such an intelligible kind. Were we unable to evoke such responses we would be unable to participate in those networks of transactions within which the actions of individual[s] agents find their place. Hence it has to be an essential part of learning to act that we learn to behave in such a way that others construe our actions as intelligible. For otherwise our behaviour would in the eyes of others have a surd and unintelligible character; as indeed it sometimes does. But when it does, we are in danger of being treated literally as idiots. Intelligibility is however not only a property which our actions must possess if they are to be understood by others as actions, to which response may then be made by further actions on their part. We ourselves have to be able to understand our own actions as intelligible, perhaps warranted as a response to some action by another and certainly warranting some kinds of response rather than others, if we are to be able to acknowledge them as actions rather than as something which we simply find ourselves doing, being as puzzled as anyone else as to what we are up to in doing whatever it is.

#### Next, is the problem: a priori principles fail to explain action because there is a divergence between the principles that justify action and the empirical world that the agents find themselves in. Grönert:

It is no accident that Engstrom characterizes practical knowledge – the realization of practical reason – i[s] terms of a counterfactual scenario. Rather that feature of his account is a necessary consequence of his commitment to what I have called Kantian Aristotelianism: This is so because, as Thompson stresses, the category of **practical reason is** due **to[o]** its **abstract**ness unsuitable **to play the role of a teleological kind.** One way to show this is by invoking **[Take] the hypothesis of intelligent extraterrestrial life**. Most likely an extraterrestrial rational life form would be causally isolated from life on earth. To put the point more precisely: **If rational life broke out on different points in the galaxy there would be clearly no** specific causal or explanatory **nexus** binding together **all (practically) rational creatures** as such. The point of this consideration is, of course, independent of how likely it is that there actually is extraterrestrial intelligent life. **What [this]** it **shows is** rather this: **the very possibility of such a life entails that the category of a** (practically) **rational subject** could only accidently coincide **with a particular teleological kind in the actual** empirical **world**. Therefore, the claim that practical reason necessarily posses a concrete generality that lies at the heart of Kantian Aristotelianism is to be construed as invoking a merely normative necessity, namely the following normative requirement: **Practically rational creatures should be connected to each other by a specific explanatory nexus**, namely by the nexus **that is** constitutive for the kingdom of ends **[but]**. This requirement is merely normative in the sense **that it does not play any role**, whatsoever, **in the explanation of what is going on in the actual empirical world**. In other words: In the actual empirical world [**where] the true nature of practical reason must remain latent and hidden**, while it only becomes manifest within a particular set of ideal circumstances. Due to this consequence of Kantian Aristotelianism, logical Aristotelianism looses its principle attraction, which I have emphasized in the last part of the paper, in its Kantian version. The attraction in question is the following: Logical Aristotelianism can take rationalizing explanations at face value, since it can acknowledge the explanatory significance that the normative statuses invoked by these explanations posses with regard to a certain class of empirical phenomena, namely intentional actions. According to Kantian Aristotelianism, by contrast, **the justification and the explanation of a practical judgment**, i.e. the circumstances conferring the status of knowledge on such a judgment and those prompting the subject to endorse it **are only externally related.** For, Kantian Aristotelianism identifies the former circumstances with a certain counterfactual scenario – the kingdom of ends – while the latter must be part of the judgments actual circumstances. Kant himself, in effect, recognizes this divergence between the justification and the explanation of a practical judgment by maintaining that we can never be sure that we are guided by the moral law and not by some hidden selfish motive. In addition **this divergence** **[means]** leads to a particular epistemological problem, since it suggests the following skeptical result: **We can never be sure that our practical judgments actually amount to knowledge**, i.e. that we actually have practically knowledge. For, this would require according to Kantian Aristotelianism that **[because] we must ascertain that the principles on which our practical judgments are based can form part of a system of principles that** might **[guide]** be adopted as a law for their conduct by **a community of all practically rational creatures.** However, we can do no more by way of justifying our practical judgments than by showing that the principles on which they are based can govern the ethical or discursive community in which we happen to participate.

#### The solution is by explaining our action through references to our lifeform, as the lifeform contains within it all the vital characteristics that define humans as human. Thompson:

Forms of nature: 'first', 'second', 'living', 'rational' and 'phronetic' by Michael Thompson

Now, we are considering the possibility of an individual self-conscious, self-knowing animal, in the presence of the premise that this only IS [only] possible where [self-consciousness is a] it is characteristic of the form the individual bears and the premise that vital predication [self-consciousness] about individuals relates them to a form.The question is, what this tells us about the kind of life in question. Remember now, what was noted above, that all the predicable items anyone has ever imagined as attachable to oneself in self-knowledge are themselves vital predications: I'm in pain, I like this stuff, I think it's going to rain, I plan on returning to the united states one day. Pleasure and pain, thought and intention are all phenomena of life, and animal life. One's weight and height are not among the objects of possible self-knowledge. On our premises, then, the self-knower in apprehending such things is always and everywhere relating himself to his form. In representing any animal as thinking or as in pain, I bring it to a certain formally distinctive unity; in representing it as bearing self-knowledge in respect of these things, I represent the animal as bringing itself to a unity of the same type. Self-consciousness is always implicitly form consciousness. And on our present premises, this will have to be [is] a feature of the life form itself: *it belongs to the prosecution of such life to see things in the light of it*, as we might say. Its representation is a part of it.

#### Thus the standard is advancing flourishing of the form. In order to determine whether an action is intelligibly consistent with the flourishing of the form, the evaluation is not of the ends that result but what the agent was tending. BOYLE and LAVIN:

Goodness and Desire. Matthew Boyle and Douglas Lavin. Harvard University To appear in S. Tenenbaum, ed., Desire, Practical Reason, and the Good, Oxford UP, forthcoming 2010].

We can begin to see how this might be made intelligible by noting that goal-directed progressives characterize a subject here and now by relating it, not necessarily to the actual future, but rather to its own future – to a[n] possible outcome that would count as something the subject itself effected, rather than [what] something that merely happened to it. Part of the point here is not special to goal-directed progressives in particular: in general, a progressive proposition of the form (7) S is doing A is not necessarily falsified because the relevant future state of affairs (S’s having done A) does not come to obtain; it is falsified only if this was not the state toward which [the subject] S was tending, the state which would have come to obtain had nothing interfered with its activity. In this sense, any progressive proposition of form (7) relates its subject, not to the actual future whatever it may be, but rather to a possible future that would count as the subject’s own. Now, the crucial Aristotelian thought is that the distinction between a future that counts as the subject’s own and one that does not must be drawn against the background of a conception of what the subject is and of what belongs to being that kind of thing – that is, of the form it bears and the nature of things that bear this form. This claim may initially sound dark and metaphysical, but we can bring it down to earth by restating it as a point about the relation between truths of the form we have been considering and truths of certain other characteristic shapes. The thought, in effect, is that where there are truths of the form (7), there must also be true judgments of form-attribution, of the form (9) S is an F and true form-characterizing judgments, of the form (10) Fs do 􀀁 (in conditions C) where the description of the activity characteristic of the kind, 􀀁, need not in general be identical to the description that characterizes what the individual is doing (A), although in the simplest sort of case it might be. In the more general case, doing A will be some specific form or manifestation of [the form] 􀀁-ing, as rolling down this hill is a specific manifestation of rolling (S is rolling down this hill; S is a bronze sphere; Bronze spheres roll (when on uneven ground)). The relation that must obtain between A and some corresponding 􀀁 would not be easy to specify, but in any case the Aristotelian thought is: there must be one

#### Prefer the standard additionally –

#### 1. Moral theories that impose absolute rules fail because there is nothing inherent to the rule nor in the interpretation of the rule that can determine how to follow the rule. LANGSETH:

Langesth, Jonathan. “Wittengenstein’s Account of Rule-Following and Its Implications”.

This section shows that **rules themselves do not determine how they are to be followed. There is nothing**, for example, **inherent in an arrow that shows us which way it is** pointing or **directing us to go.**2 Similarly, as the above quote shows, there is no means by which it can be known with complete certainty that, in following the arithmetical sequence 0, n, 2n, 3n, 4n… in line with the order “+1,” a person is following the intended rule, for he or she may be following an alternative rule that is compatible with the intended rule up to a certain point. There must be something in addition to the rule that directs us in a particular manner and indicates to us that we proceed accordingly. The argument Wittgenstein is making in Section 185 is dependent upon the fact thata rule, in order to be a rule, must be able to be broken**.** There must be correct and incorrect applications of a rule. The question that arises here is: What determines correct and incorrect application of a rule? Or, what justifies following a rule correctly? If a rule in itself does not show us how we are to follow it, then our interpretation of a rule must also not determine correct use. If interpretation was what determined correct use, there would be no incorrect application of a rule. This is the case because any interpretation can be seen to be in accordance with a rule. As section 185 points out, **if there is nothing inherent in a rule** that determines a correct interpretation of that rule then, for example, my interpretation of a pointing hand as pointing in the direction of finger-tip to wrist is perfectly compatible with the gesture of the pointing hand.There is nothing in the hand that says it is pointing in one direction rather than another. Therefore, solely in relation to the rule, **any interpretation can be justified.** Wittgenstein argues that in addition to interpretation not determining correct application of a rule, the idea of correct application is itself problematic.3 The problem with using correct application as the criteria by which we determine if someone is following a particular rule or not is that there may be any number of rules that produce actions that give evidence of correct application. Crispin Wright presents the problem most concisely: “**Any rule which we set someone to follow may be applied by him at some stage in a manner both consistent with his past application of it and other than that which we intended**.”4 This is similar to the problem with interpretation. But whereas with interpretation the problem lies in the fact that any interpretation can be seen to be in accordance with the rule, with correct application as criteria an indefinite number of rules can be followed and still produce the intended action or result. This problem has been famously introduced by Kripke’s “quus” **[For] example** in his book, Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language. In this example, Kripke shows that **in the act of completing addition problems there is no evidence to support the claim that someone is following the “plus” rule and not the “quus” rule** up to a certain point (**where “quus” is defined as** x quus y = x + y, **if [one integer]** **x, y** <**[is greater than] 57;** otherwise, **x quus y = 5 [then the sum is 5]**). Countless other examples could be posited to apply this same idea to any rule-governed activity.

#### Takes out pre-fiat arguments that attempt to establish rules to apply to a debate round to determine who wins. Rules cannot contain within themselves the rules for their own interpretations, which means there is always a gap between the rule and the application of the rule such that it is impossible to follow a rule, stopping any impact to establish a rule for debate.

#### The life form is focused on prescribing specific actions for agents, we must consider how the function of that agent pursues different ends and how they are directed to achieve what is ultimately good for that being, not actions which are imposed to all rational agents. Tenenbaum:

Sergio Tenenbaum. “Desire, Practical Reason, and the Good” Published by Oxford University Press; 1 edition (August 18, 2010)

Judgments ascribing goal-directed self movement [action] or self-change only have application to things to which a certain kind of form is attributable, a form that in turn makes room for a notion of what is good for things of that kind. We will try to give a principled account of the connection between goal-directedness and form in a moment, but first let us simply observe that, for many such judgments, the point is obviously true. If we begin by considering, not rational action, but the more rudimentary kinds of goal-directed self-change or self-movement characteristic of plants and animals, it is plain enough that recognizing them involves bringing to bear a conception of the nature of the kind in question. In recognizing that a certain plant is, e.g., budding – as opposed to, say, developing a cancer – we are relating what is going on with it to a more general conception of how things go in the life of [with] that kind of plant. In recognizing a cat as pursuing a mouse or as fleeing in response to a loud noise, we regard processes in which it is presently engaged as organized by general aims that belong to it as a cat. In these sorts of instances, at least, the general idea of processes in which a certain individual figures as an agent pursuing a goal seems to get a grip only [applies] against a certain sort of background: only inasmuch as the individual in question is regarded as an instance a certain kind of thing, a kind with a certain characteristic form or nature, a kind to which certain ends and activities belong as such. A certain standard of goodness for a thing follows inevitably from a kind characterized by a functionally-organized system of powers: this, we suppose, is the crux of Aristotle’s famous “function argument.”31 If the objection to this is that it illegitimately infers an “ought” from an “is,” we are not sure that we understand the charge. The sort of “saying what a thing is” that is at issue here is: ascribing to it a certain form, where a form is something that as such involves directedness toward certain ends. If the question is supposed to be why the thing at issue ought to pursue those ends, we ask: from what standpoint is this question [it] posed? If the thing in question genuinely is a bearer of such-and-such a form, then it is a pursuer of such-and-such ends, and essentially so. It can no more renounce these ends than it can cease to be itself.

#### 2. The ultimate end under which all other ends are contained is the form of the agent, which serves as the standard by which their actions are evaluated. Individual ends are structured hierarchically, but the fulfillment of an individual telos always comes first. Boyle and Lavin:

Goodness and Desire. Matthew Boyle and Douglas Lavin. Harvard University To appear in S. Tenenbaum, ed., Desire, Practical Reason, and the Good, Oxford UP, forthcoming 2010]. 10/15/09

We will consider how these issues bear on the deliberation of a rational agent in the next section. Before turning to that topic, however, we need to say something general about why, if being a goal-directed agent presupposes being the bearer of a form in the sense described above, such forms should equally constitute evaluative standards for the acts of the agents who bear them. The answer will be, in a way, disappointingly quick. It is that this is something we have already conceded in all but name in assigning the notion of form the place we have given it in our account. To represent an individual as the bearer of a form, in the sense we have been specifying, is to represent that individual as a sort of thing that as such pursues certain ends, ends that stand, when things are going well, in a sort of balance or equilibrium, a balance on which the existence of such things depends. To the extent that such a thing achieves those ends, it succeeds in pursuits that belong to it as such. And by the same token, to the extent that it fails, it fails in pursuits that belong to it as such. Inasmuch as the form in question is essential to individuals that bear it, these pursuits belong inalienably to those individuals: they cannot cease to be pursuers of these ends without ceasing to be. And inasmuch as their particular doings are to be understood as acts of powers directed toward certain general ends, these ends will be the measures of those acts, in the way that any act is a success or failure in virtue of its fulfilling or not fulfilling its end. That attributing a form to a thing, in this sense, involves attributing to it something that is a standard or measure of its activity, a standard relative to which it may be acting well or poorly, is thus a truism, not a controversial addition to what has already been said.

#### Impact Calculus:

#### 1. Impacts back to the structure of the form outweigh empirical harms to individuals because individual action and values are only possible in the context of a community. Schafer 11’

Schäfer, Armin. “Republican Liberty and Compulsory Voting.” 2011.

The neo-Athenian school of republicanism rejects the liberal ideal of negative liberty and sometimes comes close to a positive conception of freedom that entails not only collective self-government but also **individual self-realization.** Negative freedom, Taylor (1991) argues, is often (though not invariably) understood as an opportunity concept of liberty. To be free means to hold certain rights that shield against outside interference and endow individuals with the opportunity to act as they see fit within this realm of freedom. Whether they actually realize this opportunity or not is up to them and does not have any impact on whether or not they can be considered free.16 Taylor rejects this view and insists on an exercise concept of freedom: “On this view, one is free only to the extent that one has effectively determined oneself and the shape of one’s life” (Taylor 1991: 143). What makes Taylor a neo-republican is that he thinks that individual selfrealization **is** inescapably linked to, if not **constituted by**, **collective self-determination. Individuals can only exercise freedom** if they live **in a society that allows [them to]** for this: If realising our freedom partly depends on the society and culture in which we live, then we exercise a fuller freedom if we can help **determine the shape of this society and culture**. … In fact men’s [agents] deliberating together about what will be binding on all of them is an essential part of the exercise of freedom. … A society in which such deliberation was public and involved everyone would realize a freedom not available anywhere else or in any other mode. (Taylor 1985: 208) The neo-Athenian approach to republicanism has been articulated most forcefully by Sandel (1996). In Democracy’s Discontent, he seeks to re-establish a republican tradition of political thought that once figured prominently but has since fallen into oblivion. Sandel (1996: 5) argues that the republican understanding of liberty as “sharing in selfgovernment” used to coexist in the United States with liberalism but that, over time, it has been hidden from view. Liberalism’s victory, he contends, has ill-served US politics, since it has proven unable to address some of the nation’s most pressing problems (e.g., Sandel 1996: 201). In seeking to rehabilitate the republican tradition, Sandel wants to reinvigorate democracy. The starting point of Sandel’s republicanism is his critique of Kantian liberalism, which has become politically embodied in what he calls the “procedural republic” (Sandel 1984). The core of liberalism is the claim that **a** just **society has to [be]** remain neutral **toward the** diverse **ends its members pursue**, as long as individual aims are consistent with a similar liberty for all. Given the pluralism of modern societies, it is unjust at best and oppressive at worst to promote any particular concept of a good life. To guard against this danger, the right must take priority over the good (Sandel 1984: 82, 1996: 11). To safeguard individual freedom, the possibility of political intrusion into personal choice has to be curbed. Liberty in the procedural republic is accordingly defined negatively and in opposition to democracy – freedom begins where politics ends (Sandel 1996: 25–26).17 In contradiction of the liberal concept of freedom, republicans see liberty as inescapably bound up with sharing in self-government: “I am free insofar as I am a member of a political community that controls its own fate, and a participant in the decisions that govern its affairs” (Sandel 1996: 26). Since **active participation in public affairs is** seen as **a precondition for** individual freedom, the state is justified in promoting a particular conception of the good society and in seeking to cultivate norms of citizenship (Sandel 1996: 117). While Sandel vacillates between an instrumental and a strong version of republicanism in his book, he later speaks out in favor of the developmental, Aristotelian version, which links self-government to human excellence. Participating in politics is not like just any other activity but is one that helps to bring about valuable character traits in human beings: The strong version of republicanism, going back to Aristotle, finds the intrinsic value of political participation in a certain vision of **human flourishing.** Sharing in the governance of a political community that controls its own fate calls forth distinctive human capacities – for judgment, deliberation, and action – that would otherwise lie dormant. (Sandel 1998a: 325) **Political participation is** not just instrumentally **important to secure non-domination [and]** but is **constitutive of individual freedom**.18 The emphasis on promoting a certain idea of the good life and the link between self-government and human flourishing sets Sandel apart not only from liberals but also from republicans who reject the “communitarian” approach (Lovett/Pettit 2009: 12). Neo-Athenian republicans believe that democracy cannot work properly without public-spirited citizens. They attach overriding importance to political **participation** and support “a formative politics, a politics that **cultivates** in citizens the **qualities** of character **self-government requires**” (Sandel 1996: 6). Elements of such a formative politics are, inter alia, neighborhood assemblies, national initiatives and referendums, office allocation by lottery, workplace democracy, and universal citizen service (Barber 2003: ch. 10). Some of these elements clearly interfere with individual choice and necessitate coercion. Neo-Athenian republicans are ready to impose more far-reaching duties on citizens than liberals would accept to defend freedom as self-government: The republican conception of citizenship … seeks to cultivate a fuller range of virtues, including a moral bond with the community whose fate is at stake, a sense of obligation for one’s fellow citizens, a willingness to sacrifice individual interests for the sake of the common good, and the ability to deliberate well about common purposes and ends. (Sandel 1998b: 108) And yet none of the authors cited in this section has to my knowledge spoken out in favor of compulsory voting. Neo-Athenian republicans usually champion more demanding ways to engage citizens than casting a ballot.

#### Second, the standard is not concerned with ends based impacts because the standard evaluates actions generally, not universally. If I say that it is consistent with the human form to give to charity that statement is still true even if there are a few charities that you ought not give to. Therefore, just because affirming may lead in one instance to some negative empirical harm, that doesn’t deny that the general principle is true. Only impacts back to the constitutive nature of the agent link because they deal with the general nature of persons.

#### Third, role ethics fail – Governments and other institutions are artifacts and tools created by persons, and are constituted by individuals choosing to take part and fulfill government functions. This means that while it is possible to disregard one’s chosen role, it is impossible to deny your intrinsic human moral duties. So if the two conflict, your form obligations come first because they define your ability to even accept roles in the first place.

## Offense:

#### I advocate that the maxim of banning private handgun ownership in the United States and all relevant territories ought to be adopted generally. I defend the intent of banning handguns, so consequences are irrelevant, but I will accept neg preferences on specificity and implementation as long as I don’t abandon my maxim.

#### First, the purpose of a gun is primarily self-defense – the view that others will threaten us and that we need guns to protect ourselves destroys any notion of a community by causing social distrust.

Trivingo 13’ Franco V. Trivingo Guns and Virtue: The Virtue Ethical Case Against Gun Carrying Public Affairs Quarterly Volume 27 Number 4 10/2013//LHP JN

Habitual gun carrying seems not only to manifest[s] social distrust, but to contribute to it as well, thus further damaging the community. It is a manifestation of social distrust in that the motivation for gun carrying assumes at the start that there are dangerous and untrustworthy people out there who are likely enough to attack that one is warranted in carrying a concealed weapon. Habitual gun carrying contributes to social distrust because the agent will not participate in society as a trusting member, refuses to accept a certain level of vulnerability, denies that trust is warranted, and makes no effort to cultivate trust. As I noted above, carrying a gun produces a bias that increases the likelihood that one perceives others to be armed. Research suggests that this bias is not distributed evenly” it seems that people are more likely to perceive African Americans (than others) as armed. In short, one ends up distrusting certain socially or racially identifiable groups of people more than others. Since a number of social, cooperative goods are enabled by social trust, it is no small observation that gun carrying erodes it. Social trust seems to stand[s] in a causal relationship with institutional trust, or trust in institutions. Some theories of social trust indicate that efficient institutions produce social trust and that socially trusting individuals contribute to efficient institutions. One sees this manifested in the research on gun carrying. Gun carriers are more likely to believe that the police are ineffective in protecting them and that they therefore need to depend on themselves. The relationship between a lack of trust in society’s protection measures and the perceived likelihood of crime are interdependent. In a telling observation, Lizotte and Bourda claim that “[e]ven in the context of a high crime rate, large-scale reductions in gun ownership for protection could [happen] be brought about by convincing individuals that the criminal justice system can and will protect them.”

#### And, social trust is key to flourishing– a pre-requisite to flourishing is a well-functioning community that has faith in one another, which is necessary for achieving any desires.

Trivingo 2 Franco V. Trivingo Guns and Virtue: The Virtue Ethical Case Against Gun Carrying Public Affairs Quarterly Volume 27 Number 4 10/2013//LHP JN

This shows that trust in institutional effectiveness and social distrust are related, and it seems that at least some gun carriers are responsive to the perception of increased institutional effectiveness. However, it suggests that gun carrying also contributes to the perception of institutional ineffectiveness, such that social distrust and distrust in institutions seem mutually reinforcing. The question of whether social distrust is warranted, or what level of social trust is warranted, is a tricky one precisely because of the difficulties with establishing the conditions for reasonable trust. One can imagine that some gun carriers will be impervious to evidence about institutional effectiveness. If accepting vulnerability is a necessary condition of social trust, then the person who thinks that vulnerability is per se unacceptable will not be capable of trusting. Being violently attack is still possible, one might retort, and therefore carrying a gun is still a reasonable precaution. For such a person, social trust is ruled out from the outset. As we have seen, gun carriers are subject to certain biases, which may lead them to overstate the likelihood of crime, and there may or may not be a misfit between the beliefs and the facts. In addition, whether or not one’ estimation of the threat is accurate, one person’s threshold for acceptable vulnerability might differ wildly from another’s. I leave open the possibility that the level of social distrust might be accurate and sufficiently low to justify gun carrying. One might reasonably ask, why take the risk involved in trusting? The answer is that trust is important both for the well-functioning of societies and for the virtue and flourishing of individuals. Aristotle explicitly connects that [the] kind of society one lives in with one’s prospects for virtue and eudaimonia. For Aristotle, what grounds this connection is the recognition that human beings are social animals that are born into and live in already established social communities. These communities are, or can be, various: family, neighborhood, school, work, city, country, etc. Since we are essentially social, our flourishing is going to have to happen within and amongst these communities. These effects may be seen both at the interpersonal and communal level. Though there is little research on the relationship between social trust and interpersonal trust, at least one study suggests social trust, or propensity to trust strangers, affects relational trust, such that a relationship between two people with very high propensities to trust strangers results in the highest degree of interpersonal trust. If this is right, then social distrust will adversely affect interpersonal trust, and this will at least affect personal relationships in a negative manner. Being a better, more virtuous friend and spouse may be thus linked to social trust. On the communal level, the value of social trust is that, if it is reasonable, it [social trust] can allow for a greater level of communal cooperation, which can enable the development of virtues and increase not only one’s own potential for virtue and flourishing, but that one’s fellow citizens as well. Uslaner endorses the portrait of “trustees as ideal citizens” who are tolerant, active in the community, help to solve collective action problems, give to charity, and volunteer; as a result of these, they tend to feel good about themselves. If this is right, then social trust may itself be a virtue. By sustaining the mental habits that undergird the willingness to kill in self-defense, one risks developing a disposition to social distrust, and as I hope to have shown, this involves potential harmful consequences for virtue and flourishing. Even in the case where social distrust is warranted, it is not morally desirable because it diminishes one’s prospects for flourishing. Several studies have indicated that social trust is on the decline in the United States and has been for some time; if this is the new normal, as it were, then it would seem that from the neo-Aristotelian perspective, we are accepting a state of society that is increasingly inhibiting its citizens’ ability to flourish. The solution, as it were, would be to work to build up social trust such that people do not feel the need to arm themselves and are able to flourish, not to normalize an armed citizenry and just accept the kind of society that Aristotle would regard as uncivilized.

#### Second, not banning guns is inconsistent with the form because simply carrying guns requires they reinforce the notion of certain groups as “criminal” or “wrong” and so A) inhibit the flourishing of the carrier by preventing them from having authentic social relationships and B) prohibits the flourishing of the affected group because they are viewed as “other” and so are excluded from moral deliberation.

Trivingo 3 Franco V. Trivingo Guns and Virtue: The Virtue Ethical Case Against Gun Carrying Public Affairs Quarterly Volume 27 Number 4 10/2013//LHP JN

The habit of carrying a gun may involve[s] non-conscious representations of a generic "criminal" as evil and/or subhuman. Such repeated dehumanization may have deleterious effects on one's character by inhibiting the development of virtuous character traits, enabling the development of vicious character traits, and adversely affect-ing moral deliberation and perception. This dehumanization can be seen as operative in two ways. First, the discourse surrounding justification for gun carrying refers to "criminals," not as individual moral subjects, but as subhuman threats to the safety of moral agents. As I note above, these attitudes are likely to be mediated by social identities, that is, one will be more likely to dehumanize African Americans. Thus, the "criminal" is likely to have a certain "look." Consider Lott's description of what criminals are like: To put it bluntly, criminals are not typical citizens. As is well known, young males from their mid-teens to mid-thirties commit a disproportionate share of crime, but even this categorization can be substantially narrowed. We know that criminals tend to have low IQs as well as atypical personalities. For ex-ample, delinquents generally tend to be more 'assertive, unafraid, aggressive, uncontrolled, unconventional, extroverted and poorly socialized'. . . Other evidence indicates that criminals tend to be more impulsive and put relatively little weight on future events. Finally, we cannot ignore the unfortunate fact that crime (particularly violent crime and especially murder) is disproportionately committed against blacks by blacks." This picture assimilates criminals and psychopaths, who lack empathy and as a matter of fact have no qualms about harming other humans.59 The criminal is thus so deeply different and "other" that he—and it is almost always a "he"—is simply not afforded the same moral consideration as "regular" humans. Collins claims that this picture of the criminal, while picking up on certain statistically relevant correlations, is grossly overdrawn and unhelpful for predicting violence f° Second, in order for handgun[s] carrying to be effective,one must **be willing**—or think one is willing—**to use deadly force** should it become necessary. In On Killing, Grossman argues that successfully **training someone to** become willing to **kill** **involves** several **distancing mechanisms**, all of which involve dehumanizing the potential target.6' **The** distancing **mechanisms** **includ[ing]e** "**cultural distance**, such as racial and ethnic differences"; "**moral distance**, which takes into consideration the kind of intense belief in moral superiority"; **and** **"social distance**, which considers the impact of practice in thinking of a particular class as less than human.-62 These distancing mechanisms are meant to overcome our strong resistance to serious violence, and this resistance is a significant feature of our moral psychological makeup.63 In short, **the psychological mechanisms that enable killing bypass the resistance** by dehumanizing, in one way or another, the potential "target:. **In order to become willing to kill another human being**—even in self-defense—**it is** psychologically **enabling to see** **that person as sub- or non-human**.64 The core point here is that to the extent that one is successful, on one's own, at distancing oneself from others in preparing to commit serious violence, one is thereby and to that extent morally harming oneself. One does so precisely by compromising one's own ability to recognize the humanity in others, thereby undermining one's capacity for empathic concern. **A** reduced capacity for empathic concern **will affect** allsorts of other-regarding virtues, **since they** depend on perceiving **the other as a fellow human.**

# 1AC – Virtue:

## Framework:

#### Contemporary ethics determines an action’s rightness based upon it meeting an unconditional universal principle like maximizing utility or respecting rationality. This is the wrong starting point, and a virtue ethics paradigm is necessary to solve:

#### 1. Ethics focuses on actions, but one must first provide a proper orientation to the good. Our passions are not arbitrary, but can be merited by the objective. C.S. LEWIS:

Prof at Oxford and Cambridge. Popularizer of Philosophy and Theology one of the top Christian intellectuals of the last few hundred years. “The Abolition of Man.” 1943.

**Until** quite **modern times all teachers** and even all men **believed the universe to be such that certain** emotional **reactions** on our part **could be** either **congruous** or incongruous **to it**—believed, in fact, **that objects** did not merely receive, but **could merit, our approval or disapproval**, our reverence or our contempt. The reason why Coleridge agreed with the tourist who called the cataract sublime and disagreed with the one who called it pretty was of course that he believed inanimate nature to be such that certain responses could be more 'just' or 'ordinate' or 'appropriate' to it than others. And he believed (correctly) that the tourists thought the same. The man who called the cataract sublime was not intending simply to describe his own emotions about it: he was also claiming that the object was one which merited those emotions. But for this claim there would be nothing to agree or disagree about. To disagree with This is pretty if those words simply described the lady's feelings, would be absurd: if she had said I feel sick Coleridge would hardly have replied No; I feel quite well. When Shelley, having compared the human sensibility to an Aeolian lyre, goes on to add that it differs from a lyre in having a power of 'internal adjustment' whereby it can 'accommodate its chords to the motions of that which strikes them',9 he is assuming the same belief. 'Can you be righteous', asks Traherne, 'unless you be just in rendering to things their due esteem? All things were made to be yours and you were made to prize them according to their value.'10 St Augustine defines virtue as ordo amoris, the ordinate condition of the affections in which every object is accorded that kind of degree of love which is appropriate to it.11 Aristotle says that the aim of education is to make the pupil like and dislike what he ought.12 When the age for reflective thought comes, the pupil who has been thus trained in 'ordinate affections' or 'just sentiments' will easily find the first principles in Ethics; but to the corrupt man they will never be visible at all and he can make no progress in that science.13 Plato before him had said the same. The little human animal will not at first have the right responses. It must be trained to feel pleasure, liking, disgust, and hatred at those things which really are pleasant, likeable, disgusting and hateful.14 In the Republic, the well-nurtured youth is one 'who would see most clearly whatever was amiss in ill-made works of man or illgrown works of nature, and with a just distaste would blame and hate the ugly even from his earliest years and would give delighted praise to beauty, receiving it into his soul and being nourished by it, so that he becomes a man of gentle heart. All this before he is of an age to reason; so that when Reason at length comes to him, then, bred as he has been, he will hold out his hands in welcome and recognize her because of the affinity he bears to her.'15 In early Hinduism that conduct in men which can be called good consists in conformity to, or almost participation in, the Rta—that great ritual or pattern of nature and supernature which is revealed alike in the cosmic order, the moral virtues, and the ceremonial of the temple. Righteousness, correctness, order, the Rta, is constantly identified with satya or truth, correspondence to reality. As Plato said that the Good was 'beyond existence' and Wordsworth that through virtue the stars were strong, so the Indian masters say that the gods themselves are born of the Rta and obey it.16 The Chinese also speak of a great thing (the greatest thing) called the Tao. It is the reality beyond all predicates, the abyss that was before the Creator Himself. It is Nature, it is the Way, the Road. It is the Way in which the universe goes on, the Way in which things everlastingly emerge, stilly and tranquilly, into space and time. It is also the Way which every man should tread in imitation of that cosmic and supercosmic progression, conforming all activities to that great exemplar.17 'In ritual', say the Analects, 'it is harmony with Nature that is prized.'18 The ancient Jews likewise praise the Law as being 'true'.19 This conception in all its forms, Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, Christian, and Oriental alike, I shall henceforth refer to for brevity simply as 'the Tao'. Some of the accounts of it which I have quoted will seem, perhaps, to many of you merely quaint or even magical. But what is common to them all is something we cannot neglect. It is the doctrine of objective value, the belief that certain attitudes are really true, and others really false, to the kind of thing the universe is and the kind of things we are. Those who know the Tao can hold that **to call children delightful or old men venerable is not** simply **to record a psychological fact** about our own parental or filial emotions at the moment, **but to recognize a quality which demands a certain response** from us whether we make it or not. I myself do not enjoy the society of small children: because I speak from within the Tao I recognize this as a defect in myself—just as a man may have to recognize that he is tone deaf or colour blind. And **because our approvals and disapprovals** **are** thus **recognitions** **of** objective value or responses to **an objective order**, therefore **emotional states can be in harmony** with reason (when we feel liking for what ought to be approved) **or out of harmony with reason** (when we perceive that liking is due but cannot feel it). No emotion is, in itself, a judgement; in that sense all emotions and sentiments are alogical. But they can be reasonable or unreasonable as they conform to Reason or fail to conform. The heart never takes the place of the head: but it can, and should, obey it. Over against this stands the world of The Green Book. In it the very possibility of a sentiment being reasonable—or even unreasonable—has been excluded from the outset. It can be reasonable or unreasonable only if it conforms or fails to conform to something else. To say that the cataract is sublime means saying that our emotion of humility is appropriate or ordinate to the reality, and thus to speak of something else besides the emotion; just as to say that a shoe fits is to speak not only of shoes but of feet. But this reference to something beyond the emotion is what Gaius and Titius exclude from every sentence containing a predicate of value. Such statements, for them, refer solely to the emotion. Now the emotion, thus considered by itself, cannot be either in agreement or disagreement with Reason. It is irrational not as a paralogism is irrational, but as a physical event is irrational: it does not rise even to the dignity of error. On this view, the world of facts, without one trace of value, and the world of feelings, without one trace of truth or falsehood, justice or injustice, confront one another, and no rapprochement is possible. Hence the educational problem is wholly different according as you stand within or without the Tao. For those within, the task is to train in the pupil those responses which are in themselves appropriate, whether anyone is making them or not, and in making which the very nature of man consists. Those without, if they are logical, must regard all sentiments as equally non-rational, as mere mists between us and the real objects. As a result, they must either decide to remove all sentiments, as far as possible, from the pupil's mind; or else to encourage some sentiments for reasons that have nothing to do with their intrinsic 'justness' or 'ordinacy'. The latter course involves them in the questionable process of creating in others by 'suggestion' or incantation a mirage which their own reason has successfully dissipated. Perhaps this will become clearer if we take a concrete instance. When a Roman father told his son that it was a sweet and seemly thing to die for his country, he believed what he said. He was communicating to the son an emotion which he himself shared and which he believed to be in accord with the value which his judgement discerned in noble death. He was giving the boy the best he had, giving of his spirit to humanize him as he had given of his body to beget him. But Gaius and Titius cannot believe that in calling such a death sweet and seemly they would be saying 'something important about something'. Their own method of debunking would cry out against them if they attempted to do so. For death is not something to eat and therefore cannot be dulce in the literal sense, and it is unlikely that the real sensations preceding it will be dulce even by analogy. And as for decorum—that is only a word describing how some other people will feel about your death when they happen to think of it, which won't be often, and will certainly do you no good. There are only two courses open to Gaius and Titius. Either they must go the whole way and debunk this sentiment like any other, or must set themselves to work to produce, from outside, a sentiment which they believe to be of no value to the pupil and which may cost him his life, because it is useful to us (the survivors) that our young men should feel it. If they embark on this course the difference between the old and the new education will be an important one. Where the old initiated, the new merely 'conditions'. The old dealt with its pupils as grown birds deal with young birds when they teach them to fly; the new deals with them more as the poultry-keeper deals with young birds— making them thus or thus for purposes of which the birds know nothing. In a word, the old was a kind of propagation—men transmitting manhood to men; the new is merely propaganda. It is to their credit that Gaius and Titius embrace the first alternative. Propaganda is their abomination: not because their own philosophy gives a ground for condemning it (or anything else) but because they are better than their principles. They probably have some vague notion (I will examine it in my next lecture) that valour and good faith and justice could be sufficiently commended to the pupil on what they would call 'rational' or 'biological' or 'modern' grounds, if it should ever become necessary. In the meantime, they leave the matter alone and get on with the business of debunking. But this course, though less inhuman, is not less disastrous than the opposite alternative of cynical propaganda. Let us **suppose** for a moment that the harder **virtues could** really **be theoretically justified** with no appeal to objective value. **It** still **remains** true **that no justification of virtue will enable a [person]** man **to be virtuous. Without the aid of trained emotions the intellect is powerless against the animal organism.** I had sooner play cards against a man who was quite sceptical about ethics, but bred to believe that 'a gentleman does not cheat', than against an irreproachable moral philosopher who had been brought up among sharpers. In battle it is not syllogisms that will keep the reluctant nerves and muscles to their post in the third hour of the bombardment. The crudest sentimentalism (such as Gaius and Titius would wince at) about a flag or a country or a regiment will be of more use. We were told it all long ago by Plato. As the king governs by his executive, so Reason in man must rule the mere appetites by means of the 'spirited element'.20 The head rules the belly through the chest— the seat, as Alanus tells us, of Magnanimity,21 of emotions organized by trained habit into stable sentiments. The Chest-**Magnanimity-Sentiment**—these **are the indispensable liaison officers between cerebral** man **and visceral** man. It may even be said that it is by this middle element that man is man: for by his intellect he is mere spirit and by his appetite mere animal. The operation of The Green Book and its kind is to produce what may be called Men without Chests. **It is an outrage** that **they should be** commonly **spoken of as Intellectuals.** This gives them the chance to say that he who attacks them attacks Intelligence. It is not so. **They are not** **distinguished** from other men **by any unusual skill in finding truth** nor any virginal ardour to pursue her. **Indeed** it would be strange if they were: **a persevering devotion to truth,** a nice sense of intellectual honour, **cannot be** long **maintained without the aid of** a **sentiment** which Gaius and Titius could debunk as easily as any other. It is not excess of thought but defect of fertile and generous emotion that marks them out. Their heads are no bigger than the ordinary: it is the atrophy of the chest beneath that makes them seem so.

#### Virtue ethics fits this paradigm. These virtues are things we know are right through social norms and learning but the question becomes in its application. This is the foundation of ethics, as ethics is a learnt process – we aren’t born knowing the categorical imperative. My framework is most real world because it understands that agents have the ability to grow into moral agents through mistakes and learning. LEIBOWITZ:

PARTICULARISM IN ARISTOTLE’S NICOMACHEAN ETHICS \* Uri D. Leibowitz University of Nottingham (Forthcoming in The Journal of Moral Philosophy)

Following Burnyeat (1980), I understand Aristotle here as engaged in a dialectical inquiry towards first principles [1]. This inquiry towards first principles, Aristotle argues, must begin with what is known to us [2]. Our starting points, I suggest, are the normative statuses of particular actions. As Burnyeat observes, “the ancient commentators are agreed that Aristotle has in mind knowledge about [when] actions [are] in accordance with the virtues; these actions are the things familiar to us from which we must start, and whatwe know about them is thatthey are noble orjust” (1980:71- 72). In other words, we must start our moral theorizing from our judgments about particular actions. However, we need not know why those actions have the normative status we identify them as having [4]; one can engage in moral theorizing even if one does not know why right acts are right, as long as one can identify that they are right, or as long as one is willing to accept the judgments of “one who speaks well” as one’s starting points [6]. This is one reason why Aristotle insists that a competent student is one who has had a good moral upbringing [3]. A person who is brought up well should be able to tell apart noble acts from ignoble ones; he is expected to be able to identify courageous acts, or just acts, and he is expected to be able to tell them apart from those acts that are cowardly or unjust. One of Aristotle’s goals in the NE, I propose, is [were] to teach his students why those acts they identify as right are right. But how could one identify particular actions as right if one doesn’t know why these acts are right? A native speaker of a language canoftentell whether a sentence is grammatical even in cases in which she does not know why it is so. Naturally, only native speakers who have been “brought up well” with respect to language ar8e able to do this correctly and reliably. Aristotle thinks that with a proper moral upbringing one can form habits that would enable one to distinguish right actions from wrong ones [5]. This is one reason why in I.3 Aristotle insists that young men are not the target audience for his lectures: “for they are inexperienced in the actions that constitute life, and what is said will start from these and will be about these” (1095a3-4, Rowe trans.). Our discussion, Aristotle tells us, concerns [with] the rightness of actions but it also starts with correct judgments about which particular actions are right.The ability to identify right acts as right is acquired by habituation and the[y**]** habits we form depend on the kind of moral upbringing we get. Having correct starting points is vital to a successful dialectical inquiry; if our initial judgments about the normative status of actions are incorrect, then the first principles we discover by way of a dialectical inquiry from these judgments are likely to be false.13 In I.7 Aristotle reminds us that the appropriate degree of precision for each investigation depends on the nature of the subject matter being explored (1098a26-28). He then goes on to say this: [7] One should not demand to know the reason why, either, in the same way in all matters: in some cases, it will suffice if that something is so has been well shown, [8] as indeed is true of starting points; some are grasped by induction, some by perception, some by a sort of habituation, and others in other ways: [9] one must try to get hold of each sort in the appropriate way, and take care that they are well marked out, [10] since they have great importance in relation to what comes later. For the start of something seems to be more than half of the whole, and through it many of the things being looked for seem to become evident. (1098a33-1098b7, Rowe trans.)14 In this passage Aristotle tells us that inquiries can differ not only with respect to their appropriate degree of precision [7], but also in the way in which their starting points are obtained [8].15 Moreover, Aristotle insists that it is important to obtain the starting points for each inquiry in the appropriate way [9]. Finally, Aristotle stresses again the importance of having the correct starting points [10]. Aristotle’s goal, as I have mentioned above, is to help us understand why those acts that we identify as right—our starting points—are, in fact, right. But he warns us that the kind of explanation we ought to seek should be appropriate to the subject matter we are investigating [7]. In geometry we can give demonstrative explanation. But we “should not demand to know the reason why in the same way in all matters.” Explanations of the rightness of actionswill take adifferent form[s]. “Pure science involves demonstration,” Aristotle tells us, “while things whose starting points or first causes can be other than they are do not admit of demonstrations” (VI.5:1140a34). After reminding us in II.2 that the subject matter of ethics lacks fixity and hence that our account will not be veryprecise,16 Aristotle goes on to say this: “But though our present account is of this nature we must give what help we can” (1104a10, Ross trans.). What immediately follows, are Aristotle’s observations about the harmful effects of excess and deficiency and the positive effects of the proportionate amount, or the mean. These observations, Aristotle tells us, hold true for health and strength as well as for characteristics like temperance, courage, and other virtues. To act in accordance with the mean is not only the way to acquire virtuous characteristics, but is also the mark of virtuous actions. Aristotle seems to think that his comments on the mean are helpful. But what kind of help does he think these comments provide? Broadie (1991) proposes the following hypothesis: [Aristotle] could be deceived into thinking the doctrine of the mean useful in ways in which in fact it is not. This may be what happens in NE II.2, where he bewails the impossibility of giving exact rules for correct particular responses (1104a5-9); then says that he must give what help he can (1104a10- 11); and then goes on to discuss, not responses, but dispositions.” (101-2) If Aristotle had thought that his comments on the mean can help us to identify the right response in various situations, then, like Broadie, I think he was mistaken about their usefulness. However, I doubt that this is what Aristotle had in mind. Indeed, in VI.1 Aristotle explicitly tells us that he does not think that his remarks on the mean can help us to identify what we ought to do: We stated earlier that we must choose the median, and not excess or deficiency, and that the median is what right reason dictates...but this statement, true though it is, lacks clarity. In all other fields of endeavor in which scientific knowledge is possible, it is indeed true to say that we must exert ourselves or relax neither too much nor too little, but to an intermediate extent and as right reason demands. But if this is the only thing a person knows, he will be none the wiser: he will, for example, not know what kind of medicines to apply to his body, if he is merely told to apply whatever medical science prescribes and in a manner in which a medical expert applies them.” (VI.1:1138b19-35) So what kind of help are these comments on the mean supposed to provide? I propose that these remarks are meant to help us to explain why those acts that we already know are virtuous are virtuous. If we can tell—as we must be able to in order to obtain starting points for our ethical inquiry—that a particular act is courageous, for instance, we now know that this action [it] lies in the mean. So we can explain its rightness by pointing out that this act is neither excessive nor deficient**.** This, of course, is a rudimentary sketch of an explanatory schema but we can now already identify the basic structure of the explanation: if an act is right, then we should be able to identify a scale on which it is neither excessive nor deficient.Aristotle recognizes that what he has given us so far is extremely undeveloped and he goes on to expound on this explanatory model in several phases. First, after presenting the bare bones of his explanatory schema, Aristotle discusses some general features of the virtues: he tells us that a mark of an action performed virtuously is that the agent of the action takes pleasure in performing the action (II.3); he distinguishes between a virtuous action and an action performed virtuously (II.4); and he identifies the genus and differentia of virtue (II.5-6). By the end of II.6 we get Aristotle’s definition of virtue: “We may thus conclude that virtue or excellence is a characteristic involving choice, and that it consists in observing the mean relative to us, a mean which is defined by a rational principle, such as a man of practical wisdom would use to determine it” (1106b35-1107a1). We now know a bit more about the proper explanation of the virtuousness of a particular action. Consider: “Why is this action of standing one’s ground in battle courageous?” The proper answer will take the following form: “This action is courageous because the agent chose to perform it, and it is located in the mean (relative to the agent)17 of some relevant scale.” What we have so far is a sketch of an explanatory schema and we must now learn how to properly fill in this schema in order to provide satisfactory explanations of the rightness of individual actions. Aristotle turns to this in II.7: However, this general statement is not enough; we must also show that it fits particular instances. For in a discussion of moral actions, although the general statements have a wider range of application, statements on particular points have more truth in them: actions are concerned with particulars and our statements must harmonize with them.” (1107a28-33) We already know that in order to explain why a particular act is virtuous we must locate this action in the mean of some relevant scale—this statement has a wide range of application—but in order to appreciate its truth, we must see how it applies to particular virtuous actions, since we are, most fundamentally, concerned with the rightness of individual actions. Aristotle, then, wants to show us that by applying his schema properly we can generate adequate explanation of the rightness of particular actions. In the remainder of II.7 Aristotle lists the various scales that are relevant to each virtue. And whenever possible he introduces the relevant vocabulary we should use in our explanation. For example, if we want to explain why an act is courageous, we should locate the agent’s emotional state while performing the action as a mean on a scale (or scales)18 of fear and confidence; the agent might be reckless if he exceeds in confidence, or cowardly if he is deficient in confidence. If we want to explain why an action is generous we should locate the action as a mean on a scale ranging from stinginess to extravagance. Aristotle goes on to list relevant scales for other virtues. Yet he is well aware that even now we have only been given a sketch—“For our present purposes, we must rest content with an outline and a summary, but we shall later define these qualities more precisely” (II.7:1107b15). By the end of II.7, if we are asked, for example, why Ms. Smith’s act of donating $100,000 to cancer research is generous, we could say that she chose to perform this action, and that given her economic and social situation, donating $100,000 to this cause was neither stingy nor extravagant. Moreover, we know that if she did not take pleasure in her generous donation, then she did not act generously. This explanatory schema does not generate deductive explanations. From the fact that Ms. Smith’s action was neither stingy nor extravagant it does not follow that her action was right or virtuous; there may have been other, more urgent, causes to which to donate, or there could have been good reasons not to donate to the particular organization that she had chosen. So explanations produced by applying Aristotle’s explanatory schema do not guarantee the truth of the explanandum.19 But as we have seen, Aristotle insists that we “should not demand to know the reason why in the same way in all matters,” and that explanations in ethics “do not admit of demonstrations.” This is why it is important for Aristotle that we already know that the action is right before we explain why it is right; that the act is right is part of the data we have at our disposal when we explain its rightness. The reading of Aristotle I propose helps us to make sense of several features of Aristotle’s work that commentators have found perplexing. First, it helps us to understand the importance of the doctrine of the mean for Aristotle’s project. Some readers of the NE are puzzled by the seriousness with which Aristotle approaches the doctrine of the mean. As Broadie (1991) puts it: Aristotle regards [the doctrine of the mean] as an important contribution, to judge by the solemnity with which he introduces it and the many pages where he strains over the details of its application. Yet the doctrine often gets a disappointed reception. It seems at first to offer special illumination, but in the end, according to its critics, it only deals with truisms together with a questionable taxonomy of virtues and vices. (95) On my reading the doctrine of the mean plays an important explanatory role which lies at the heart of Aristotle’s project. Although the doctrine of the mean doesn’t identify for us the features that make right actions right, it does tell us what a proper explanation of the rightness of a particular action should look like. We obtain a satisfactory explanation only when we replace the truisms about the harmful effects of excess and deficiency and the positive effects of the proportionate amount with the specific features of the action/situation; i.e., we must identify the relevant scale on which the action lies in the mean, and we have to [and] identify [it] the meanrelative to the agent of the action and the situation in which the act is performed. This is why Aristotle methodically lists not only those virtues and vices that have names, but also those that do not have names, and this is why he identifies those qualities that resemble virtues but are not quite virtues. The proper explanation of the rightness of each individual action depends on the specific features of the particular act in question. “What sort of things are to be chosen and in return for what, it is not easy to state; for there are many differences in the particular cases” (III.1:1110b8, Ross trans.). There is no algorithm that we can use to generate adequate explanations, as Aristotle emphasizes again in III.4: “What is good and pleasant differs with different characteristics and conditions, and perhaps the chief distinction of a man of high moral standards is his ability to see the truth in each particular moral question, since he is, as it were, the standard and measure for such questions” (1113a31-34). This is why Aristotle gives us many examples of how to generate explanations by substituting the truisms in the generic explanatory schema with particular features of actions. In his discussion of courage Aristotle specifies different possible objects of fear (e.g., death, poverty, disease), and various contexts in which one could exemplify courage (e.g., in battle, at sea, in illness). “He is courageous,” we are told, who endures and fears the right things, for the right motive, in the right manner, and at the right time, and who displays confidence in similar ways. For a courageous man feels and acts according to the merits of each case and as reason guides him.” (III.7:1115b19-20) When we explain the rightness of a particular courageous action, we must replace the hedges (“the right things,” “in the right manner,” etc.) with specific features of the action in question; for example, his action was courageous because he left his family in order to join the army and he risked his life in order to protect his country when no non-military option was available to resolve the conflict. (7-14)

#### 2. Traditional normative theories base morality on absolute rules like respecting the categorical imperative, but whenever one tries to justify an objective or universal rule, that rule can only be derived from a previous rule, which must itself be derived from something prior. This regresses infinitely since every assertion needs its own justification. This out pre-fiat arguments that attempt to establish rules to apply to a debate round to determine who wins. Rules cannot contain within themselves the rules for their own interpretations, which means there is always a gap between the rule and the application of the rule such that it is impossible to follow a rule, stopping any impact to establish a rule for debate.

#### A virtue paradigm instead recognizes goodness by relating questions of ethics to good character. A virtuous life becomes definable only in accordance with the values that we hold to be good for us in a social context, not rules imposed on an agent like moral theories. MAYO:

Mayo, Bernard (Professor of Moral Philosophy at University of St. Andrews). “Ethics and the Moral Life.” St. Martin’s Press. 1958.

No doubt **the** fundamental **moral question is** just “**what ought I to do?”** And according to the philosophy of [traditional] moral **principles** the **answer [with]** (which must be an imperative **“Do this”**) must be **derived from a** conjunction of premises consisting (in the simplest case) firstly of a **rule** or universal imperative, enjoining (or forbidding) all actions of a certain type in situations of a certain type, and, secondly, a statement to the effect that this is a situation of that type, falling under the rule. IN practice the emphasis may be on simply only one of these premises, the other being assumed or taken for granted: one may answer the question “what ought I to do?” either by quoting a rule which I am to adopt, or by showing that my case is legislated for by a rule which I do adopt… If I am in doubt whether to tell the truth about his condition to a dying man, my doubt may be resolved by showing that the case comes under a rule about the avoidance of unnecessary suffering, which I am assumed to accept. But if the case is without precedent in my moral career, my problem may be a soluble only by adopting a new principle about what I am to do now and the future about cases of this kind. This second possibility offer a connection with moral ideas. Suppose my perplexity is not merely an unprecedented situation which I could cope with by adopting a new rule. **Suppose the new rule is** thoroughly **inconsistent with my existing** moral **code.** This may happen, for instance, if the moral code is one to which I only pay lip-service, if… its authority is not yet internalized, or if its final rejection awaits a moral crisis such as we are assuming to occur. What **I** now **need** is **not a** rule for deciding how to act in this situation and other of its kind. I need a whole set of rules. A complete morality, new principle to live by. Now, according to the philosophy of moral character, there is another way of answering the fundamental question “what ought I to do?” instead of quoting a rule, **we quote** a quality of character, **a virtue**: we say “be brave,” or “be patient” or “Be lenient.” We may even say “be a man”: if I am in doubt, say, whether to take are risk, and someone says “Be a man,” meaning a morally sound man, in this case a man of sufficient courage. (compare the very different ideal invoked in “be a gentleman.” I shall not discuss whether this is a Moral ideal.) Here, too, we have the extreme cases, where a man’s moral perplexity extends not merely to a particular situations but to his whole way of living. And now **the question** “what ought I to do?” **turns into the question “What ought I to be?”** as, indeed, it was treated in the first place. (“be brave.”) **It is answered**, not by quoting a rule or a set of rules, but **by describing a** quality of character of a **type of person.** And here the ethics of character gains a practical simplicity, which offsets the greater logical simplicity of the ethics of principles. We do not have to give a list of characteristics or virtues, as we might list a set of principles we can give a unity to our answer. Of course we can in theory give a unity to our principles: this is implied by speaking of a set of principles. But if such a set is to be a system and not merely aggregate, the unity we are looking is a logical one, namely the possibility that some principles are deductible from others, and the ultimately from one. But the attempt to construct a deductive moral system is notoriously difficult, and in any case ill-founded. Why should we expect that all rules of conduct should be ultimately reducible to a few? But when we are asked “what shall I be?” we can readily give a unity to our answer, though not a logical unity. It is thne **unity of character**. A person’s character **is not merely a list of dispositions**; it has the unity of something that is more than the sum of its parts. And **we can say**, in answer to our morally perplexed questioner, not organic only “be this” and “be that,” but also **“be like so and so”—where so-and-so is** either an ideal type of character, or else an actual person taken as **representative of** the **[an] ideal**, as exemplar. Examples of the first are Plato’s “just man” in the Republic; Aristotle’s man of practical wisdom, in the Nicomachean Ethics; Augustine’s citizen of the City of God; the good community; the America way of life (which is a collective expression for a type of character). Examples of the second kind, the exemplar, are Socrates, Christ, Buddha, St. Francis, the heroes of epic writers and of novelists. Indeed the idea of the Hero, as well as the idea of the Saint, are very much the expression of this attitude to morality. Heroes and saints are not merely people who did things. They are people whom we are expected, and expect ourselves, to imitate. And imitating them means not merely doing what they did; it means being like them. Their status is not in the least like that of legislators whose laws we admire; for the character of the legislator is irrelevant to our judgment about his legislation. The heroes and saints did not merely give us principles to live by (though some of the did that as well): they gave us [as] examples to follow.

#### The standard is consistency with a virtue ethics paradigm.

#### 1. Virtues are constitutive of willing any action so it’s a side constraint on ethics because it presumes a conception of action for it to be able to guide action. KORSGAARD:

“How to be an Aristotelian Kantian Constitutivist” Christine M. Korsgaard

On this interpretation, when we say that someone has a virtue, we are not merely gesturing third-personally at the fact that she has good principles. We are saying that her passions and emotions are in a condition that is conducive to doing the right thing, to acting on the right principles. To say that someone has a virtue is not just to praise the condition of her will from a third personal point of view, but to assert that she has some specific property that is conducive to the good functioning of her will. Or – to return to my earlier point about the unity of the virtues – it is to assert[s] that she does not have some specific property (e.g. undue fearfulness in the face of certain threats) that is detrimental to the operations of her will. But we can say that while thinking of the will or at any rate of the agent’s principles as something that is separate from virtues themselves. But of course Aristotle himself does not think of the virtues merely as aids to the will, where the will might be conceived as something separate. I cannot adequately defend what I am about to say here so I will just assert it. Aristotle believes thant all of our passions and emotions are associated with pleasures and pains, and that pleasures and pains amount to a kind of perception[s] of goodness and badness. He also thinks that our perceptions of goodness and badness move us directly. He says: To perceive, then is like bare asserting or thinking; but when the object is pleasant or painful, the soul make a sort of affirmation or negation, and pursues or avoids the object. ... Both avoidance and appetite when actual are identical with this: the faculty of appetite and avoidance are not different, either from one another or from the faculty of sense-perception; but their being is different. To the thinking soul images serve as if they were contents of perception (and when it asserts or denies them to be good or bad it avoids or pursues them.) That is why the soul never thinks without an image. (On the Soul 431a7-16) It follows that all of our passions and emotions together inform a kind of normative conception of the world, in light of which we literally see things as good and bad and act accordingly. I also believe that Aristotle thinks that this normative conception of is the “moving principle” that makes our actions voluntary – that is, that makes them our own (NE 3.1). We act from that conception, in the sense that it is what moves us. If that is right, then for Aristotle there is a way that a person’s [thus] virtues are constitutive of her will. (26-27)

#### This justification comes first – a framework must generate a conception of action otherwise obligations and prohibitions would devolve to arbitrary movement. Virtue ethics is constitutive of willing and taking actions, so it determines what constitutes an action, precluding every other framework.

#### 2. Actor-Specificity: states must promote virtuous decision-making through a particularistic scope because legal systems can’t apply in every instance. SILVIA:

“Virtue Ethics And Communitarianism” by Rui Silva, University of the Azores

“The second distinctive trait of virtue ethics is closely connected with the first one: virtue ethics is suspicious of the guiding role of principles and rules. The point was already made by Aristotle, namely in his discussion of the legal virtue of equity. Equity is required because laws and rules are too generic to accommodate all possible cases that judges can face. **No legal system can avoid** the occurrence of the so-called **hard cases**: The reason for this is that **law is always a general statement, yet there are cases which it is not possible to cover** in a general statement. [...] The material of conduct is essentially irregular. [...] This is the essential nature of the equitable: it is a rectification of law where **law is defective because of its generality**. (Nichomachean Ethics 1137b) There are, indeed, two basic problems when we try to act solely on principles. Firstly, **there is a gap between** general **principles and the unpredictable diversity of situations** that demand moral decisions; **as a result it is** often very **difficult**, if not impossible, **to** determine how to **apply a principle to certain**, atypical **situations.** In other words, it is possible to arrive at different conclusions departing from the same principles. Secondly, there can be clashes between equally valuable principles, depriving thereby the agent of action guidance. We may add that **virtue ethics**, far from endorsing moral universalism, is sensitive to the role of context in ethics. In the words of Julia Annas (2004: 741), virtue ethics **is opposed to “one-size-fits-all” accounts** of ethics. Virtue ethics invites us to **[and] adopt[s] moral contextualism**, but it should be noted that contextualism must not be confused with relativism. After this brief presentation of virtue ethics, I will try to clarify and legitimize the idea of moral reliability, which is crucial for virtue ethics. For that purpose, the humanist idea of Bildung will be integrated in the project of virtue ethics. In a third section, I will analyse the most significant affinities between virtue ethics and communitarianism. Finally, I will claim that we can develop, with the help of the idea of Bildung, a form of virtue ethics that is not committed to strong forms of communitarianism. 2. **Because it does not conceive of** moral **judgements on the basis of deductions from principles** or decision procedures, virtue ethics is often considered as vague; **instead of focusing on** consequences or **rules,** virtue ethics **[it] is based on the** reliability of the moral **agent**, and this view may sound puzzling for modern moral philosophers. Standard formulations of virtue ethics are, indeed, somewhat vague. Let us consider, for example, the following presentation of the “fundamental premise” of virtue ethics:” (3-4)

#### Impact Calculus:

#### 1. In order to determine whether an action is intelligibly consistent with the form, the evaluation is not of the ends that result but what the agent was tending. BOYLE and LAVIN:

Goodness and Desire. Matthew Boyle and Douglas Lavin. Harvard University To appear in S. Tenenbaum, ed., Desire, Practical Reason, and the Good, Oxford UP, forthcoming 2010].

We can begin to see how this might be made intelligible by noting that goal-directed progressives characterize a subject here and now by relating it, not necessarily to the actual future, but rather to its own future – to a[n] possible outcome that would count as something the subject itself effected, rather than [what] something that merely happened to it. Part of the point here is not special to goal-directed progressives in particular: in general, a progressive proposition of the form (7) S is doing A is not necessarily falsified because the relevant future state of affairs (S’s having done A) does not come to obtain; it is falsified only if this was not the state toward which [the subject] S was tending, the state which would have come to obtain had nothing interfered with its activity. In this sense, any progressive proposition of form (7) relates its subject, not to the actual future whatever it may be, but rather to a possible future that would count as the subject’s own. Now, the crucial Aristotelian thought is that the distinction between a future that counts as the subject’s own and one that does not must be drawn against the background of a conception of what the subject is and of what belongs to being that kind of thing – that is, of the form it bears and the nature of things that bear this form. This claim may initially sound dark and metaphysical, but we can bring it down to earth by restating it as a point about the relation between truths of the form we have been considering and truths of certain other characteristic shapes. The thought, in effect, is that where there are truths of the form (7), there must also be true judgments of form-attribution, of the form (9) S is an F and true form-characterizing judgments, of the form (10) Fs do 􀀁 (in conditions C) where the description of the activity characteristic of the kind, 􀀁, need not in general be identical to the description that characterizes what the individual is doing (A), although in the simplest sort of case it might be. In the more general case, doing A will be some specific form or manifestation of [the form] 􀀁-ing, as rolling down this hill is a specific manifestation of rolling (S is rolling down this hill; S is a bronze sphere; Bronze spheres roll (when on uneven ground)). The relation that must obtain between A and some corresponding 􀀁 would not be easy to specify, but in any case the Aristotelian thought is: there

must be one

#### 2. Impacts back to the structure of the form outweigh empirical harms to individuals because individual action and values are only possible in the context of a community. Schafer 11’

Schäfer, Armin. “Republican Liberty and Compulsory Voting.” 2011.

The neo-Athenian school of republicanism rejects the liberal ideal of negative liberty and sometimes comes close to a positive conception of freedom that entails not only collective self-government but also **individual self-realization.** Negative freedom, Taylor (1991) argues, is often (though not invariably) understood as an opportunity concept of liberty. To be free means to hold certain rights that shield against outside interference and endow individuals with the opportunity to act as they see fit within this realm of freedom. Whether they actually realize this opportunity or not is up to them and does not have any impact on whether or not they can be considered free.16 Taylor rejects this view and insists on an exercise concept of freedom: “On this view, one is free only to the extent that one has effectively determined oneself and the shape of one’s life” (Taylor 1991: 143). What makes Taylor a neo-republican is that he thinks that individual selfrealization **is** inescapably linked to, if not **constituted by**, **collective self-determination. Individuals can only exercise freedom** if they live **in a society that allows [them to]** for this: If realising our freedom partly depends on the society and culture in which we live, then we exercise a fuller freedom if we can help **determine the shape of this society and culture**. … In fact men’s [agents] deliberating together about what will be binding on all of them is an essential part of the exercise of freedom. … A society in which such deliberation was public and involved everyone would realize a freedom not available anywhere else or in any other mode. (Taylor 1985: 208) The neo-Athenian approach to republicanism has been articulated most forcefully by Sandel (1996). In Democracy’s Discontent, he seeks to re-establish a republican tradition of political thought that once figured prominently but has since fallen into oblivion. Sandel (1996: 5) argues that the republican understanding of liberty as “sharing in selfgovernment” used to coexist in the United States with liberalism but that, over time, it has been hidden from view. Liberalism’s victory, he contends, has ill-served US politics, since it has proven unable to address some of the nation’s most pressing problems (e.g., Sandel 1996: 201). In seeking to rehabilitate the republican tradition, Sandel wants to reinvigorate democracy. The starting point of Sandel’s republicanism is his critique of Kantian liberalism, which has become politically embodied in what he calls the “procedural republic” (Sandel 1984). The core of liberalism is the claim that **a** just **society has to [be]** remain neutral **toward the** diverse **ends its members pursue**, as long as individual aims are consistent with a similar liberty for all. Given the pluralism of modern societies, it is unjust at best and oppressive at worst to promote any particular concept of a good life. To guard against this danger, the right must take priority over the good (Sandel 1984: 82, 1996: 11). To safeguard individual freedom, the possibility of political intrusion into personal choice has to be curbed. Liberty in the procedural republic is accordingly defined negatively and in opposition to democracy – freedom begins where politics ends (Sandel 1996: 25–26).17 In contradiction of the liberal concept of freedom, republicans see liberty as inescapably bound up with sharing in self-government: “I am free insofar as I am a member of a political community that controls its own fate, and a participant in the decisions that govern its affairs” (Sandel 1996: 26). Since **active participation in public affairs is** seen as **a precondition for** individual freedom, the state is justified in promoting a particular conception of the good society and in seeking to cultivate norms of citizenship (Sandel 1996: 117). While Sandel vacillates between an instrumental and a strong version of republicanism in his book, he later speaks out in favor of the developmental, Aristotelian version, which links self-government to human excellence. Participating in politics is not like just any other activity but is one that helps to bring about valuable character traits in human beings: The strong version of republicanism, going back to Aristotle, finds the intrinsic value of political participation in a certain vision of **human flourishing.** Sharing in the governance of a political community that controls its own fate calls forth distinctive human capacities – for judgment, deliberation, and action – that would otherwise lie dormant. (Sandel 1998a: 325) **Political participation is** not just instrumentally **important to secure non-domination [and]** but is **constitutive of individual freedom**.18 The emphasis on promoting a certain idea of the good life and the link between self-government and human flourishing sets Sandel apart not only from liberals but also from republicans who reject the “communitarian” approach (Lovett/Pettit 2009: 12). Neo-Athenian republicans believe that democracy cannot work properly without public-spirited citizens. They attach overriding importance to political **participation** and support “a formative politics, a politics that **cultivates** in citizens the **qualities** of character **self-government requires**” (Sandel 1996: 6). Elements of such a formative politics are, inter alia, neighborhood assemblies, national initiatives and referendums, office allocation by lottery, workplace democracy, and universal citizen service (Barber 2003: ch. 10). Some of these elements clearly interfere with individual choice and necessitate coercion. Neo-Athenian republicans are ready to impose more far-reaching duties on citizens than liberals would accept to defend freedom as self-government: The republican conception of citizenship … seeks to cultivate a fuller range of virtues, including a moral bond with the community whose fate is at stake, a sense of obligation for one’s fellow citizens, a willingness to sacrifice individual interests for the sake of the common good, and the ability to deliberate well about common purposes and ends. (Sandel 1998b: 108) And yet none of the authors cited in this section has to my knowledge spoken out in favor of compulsory voting. Neo-Athenian republicans usually champion more demanding ways to engage citizens than casting a ballot.

#### 3. The standard is not concerned with ends based impacts because the standard evaluates actions generally, not universally. If I say that it is consistent with the human form to give to charity that statement is still true even if there are a few charities that you ought not give to. Therefore, just because affirming may lead in one instance to some negative empirical harm, that doesn’t deny that the general principle is true. Only impacts back to the constitutive nature of the agent link because they deal with the general nature of persons.

## Offense:

#### I advocate that the maxim of banning private handgun ownership in the United States and all relevant territories ought to be adopted generally. I defend the intent of banning handguns, so consequences are irrelevant, but I will accept neg preferences on specificity and implementation as long as I don’t abandon my maxim.

#### First, the purpose of a gun is primarily self-defense – the view that others will threaten us and that we need guns to protect ourselves destroys any notion of a community by causing social distrust.

Trivingo 13’ Franco V. Trivingo Guns and Virtue: The Virtue Ethical Case Against Gun Carrying Public Affairs Quarterly Volume 27 Number 4 10/2013//LHP JN

Habitual gun carrying seems not only to manifest[s] social distrust, but to contribute to it as well, thus further damaging the community. It is a manifestation of social distrust in that the motivation for gun carrying assumes at the start that there are dangerous and untrustworthy people out there who are likely enough to attack that one is warranted in carrying a concealed weapon. Habitual gun carrying contributes to social distrust because the agent will not participate in society as a trusting member, refuses to accept a certain level of vulnerability, denies that trust is warranted, and makes no effort to cultivate trust. As I noted above, carrying a gun produces a bias that increases the likelihood that one perceives others to be armed. Research suggests that this bias is not distributed evenly” it seems that people are more likely to perceive African Americans (than others) as armed. In short, one ends up distrusting certain socially or racially identifiable groups of people more than others. Since a number of social, cooperative goods are enabled by social trust, it is no small observation that gun carrying erodes it. Social trust seems to stand[s] in a causal relationship with institutional trust, or trust in institutions. Some theories of social trust indicate that efficient institutions produce social trust and that socially trusting individuals contribute to efficient institutions. One sees this manifested in the research on gun carrying. Gun carriers are more likely to believe that the police are ineffective in protecting them and that they therefore need to depend on themselves. The relationship between a lack of trust in society’s protection measures and the perceived likelihood of crime are interdependent. In a telling observation, Lizotte and Bourda claim that “[e]ven in the context of a high crime rate, large-scale reductions in gun ownership for protection could [happen] be brought about by convincing individuals that the criminal justice system can and will protect them.”

#### And, social trust is key to flourishing– a pre-requisite to flourishing is a well-functioning community that has faith in one another, which is necessary for achieving any desires.

Trivingo 2 Franco V. Trivingo Guns and Virtue: The Virtue Ethical Case Against Gun Carrying Public Affairs Quarterly Volume 27 Number 4 10/2013//LHP JN

This shows that trust in institutional effectiveness and social distrust are related, and it seems that at least some gun carriers are responsive to the perception of increased institutional effectiveness. However, it suggests that gun carrying also contributes to the perception of institutional ineffectiveness, such that social distrust and distrust in institutions seem mutually reinforcing. The question of whether social distrust is warranted, or what level of social trust is warranted, is a tricky one precisely because of the difficulties with establishing the conditions for reasonable trust. One can imagine that some gun carriers will be impervious to evidence about institutional effectiveness. If accepting vulnerability is a necessary condition of social trust, then the person who thinks that vulnerability is per se unacceptable will not be capable of trusting. Being violently attack is still possible, one might retort, and therefore carrying a gun is still a reasonable precaution. For such a person, social trust is ruled out from the outset. As we have seen, gun carriers are subject to certain biases, which may lead them to overstate the likelihood of crime, and there may or may not be a misfit between the beliefs and the facts. In addition, whether or not one’ estimation of the threat is accurate, one person’s threshold for acceptable vulnerability might differ wildly from another’s. I leave open the possibility that the level of social distrust might be accurate and sufficiently low to justify gun carrying. One might reasonably ask, why take the risk involved in trusting? The answer is that trust is important both for the well-functioning of societies and for the virtue and flourishing of individuals. Aristotle explicitly connects that [the] kind of society one lives in with one’s prospects for virtue and eudaimonia. For Aristotle, what grounds this connection is the recognition that human beings are social animals that are born into and live in already established social communities. These communities are, or can be, various: family, neighborhood, school, work, city, country, etc. Since we are essentially social, our flourishing is going to have to happen within and amongst these communities. These effects may be seen both at the interpersonal and communal level. Though there is little research on the relationship between social trust and interpersonal trust, at least one study suggests social trust, or propensity to trust strangers, affects relational trust, such that a relationship between two people with very high propensities to trust strangers results in the highest degree of interpersonal trust. If this is right, then social distrust will adversely affect interpersonal trust, and this will at least affect personal relationships in a negative manner. Being a better, more virtuous friend and spouse may be thus linked to social trust. On the communal level, the value of social trust is that, if it is reasonable, it [social trust] can allow for a greater level of communal cooperation, which can enable the development of virtues and increase not only one’s own potential for virtue and flourishing, but that one’s fellow citizens as well. Uslaner endorses the portrait of “trustees as ideal citizens” who are tolerant, active in the community, help to solve collective action problems, give to charity, and volunteer; as a result of these, they tend to feel good about themselves. If this is right, then social trust may itself be a virtue. By sustaining the mental habits that undergird the willingness to kill in self-defense, one risks developing a disposition to social distrust, and as I hope to have shown, this involves potential harmful consequences for virtue and flourishing. Even in the case where social distrust is warranted, it is not morally desirable because it diminishes one’s prospects for flourishing. Several studies have indicated that social trust is on the decline in the United States and has been for some time; if this is the new normal, as it were, then it would seem that from the neo-Aristotelian perspective, we are accepting a state of society that is increasingly inhibiting its citizens’ ability to flourish. The solution, as it were, would be to work to build up social trust such that people do not feel the need to arm themselves and are able to flourish, not to normalize an armed citizenry and just accept the kind of society that Aristotle would regard as uncivilized.

#### Second, not banning guns is inconsistent with the form because simply carrying guns requires they reinforce the notion of certain groups as “criminal” or “wrong” and so A) inhibit the flourishing of the carrier by preventing them from having authentic social relationships and B) prohibits the flourishing of the affected group because they are viewed as “other” and so are excluded from moral deliberation.

Trivingo 3 Franco V. Trivingo Guns and Virtue: The Virtue Ethical Case Against Gun Carrying Public Affairs Quarterly Volume 27 Number 4 10/2013//LHP JN

The habit of carrying a gun may involve[s] non-conscious representations of a generic "criminal" as evil and/or subhuman. Such repeated dehumanization may have deleterious effects on one's character by inhibiting the development of virtuous character traits, enabling the development of vicious character traits, and adversely affect-ing moral deliberation and perception. This dehumanization can be seen as operative in two ways. First, the discourse surrounding justification for gun carrying refers to "criminals," not as individual moral subjects, but as subhuman threats to the safety of moral agents. As I note above, these attitudes are likely to be mediated by social identities, that is, one will be more likely to dehumanize African Americans. Thus, the "criminal" is likely to have a certain "look." Consider Lott's description of what criminals are like: To put it bluntly, criminals are not typical citizens. As is well known, young males from their mid-teens to mid-thirties commit a disproportionate share of crime, but even this categorization can be substantially narrowed. We know that criminals tend to have low IQs as well as atypical personalities. For ex-ample, delinquents generally tend to be more 'assertive, unafraid, aggressive, uncontrolled, unconventional, extroverted and poorly socialized'. . . Other evidence indicates that criminals tend to be more impulsive and put relatively little weight on future events. Finally, we cannot ignore the unfortunate fact that crime (particularly violent crime and especially murder) is disproportionately committed against blacks by blacks." This picture assimilates criminals and psychopaths, who lack empathy and as a matter of fact have no qualms about harming other humans.59 The criminal is thus so deeply different and "other" that he—and it is almost always a "he"—is simply not afforded the same moral consideration as "regular" humans. Collins claims that this picture of the criminal, while picking up on certain statistically relevant correlations, is grossly overdrawn and unhelpful for predicting violence f° Second, in order for handgun[s] carrying to be effective,one must **be willing**—or think one is willing—**to use deadly force** should it become necessary. In On Killing, Grossman argues that successfully **training someone to** become willing to **kill** **involves** several **distancing mechanisms**, all of which involve dehumanizing the potential target.6' **The** distancing **mechanisms** **includ[ing]e** "**cultural distance**, such as racial and ethnic differences"; "**moral distance**, which takes into consideration the kind of intense belief in moral superiority"; **and** **"social distance**, which considers the impact of practice in thinking of a particular class as less than human.-62 These distancing mechanisms are meant to overcome our strong resistance to serious violence, and this resistance is a significant feature of our moral psychological makeup.63 In short, **the psychological mechanisms that enable killing bypass the resistance** by dehumanizing, in one way or another, the potential "target:. **In order to become willing to kill another human being**—even in self-defense—**it is** psychologically **enabling to see** **that person as sub- or non-human**.64 The core point here is that to the extent that one is successful, on one's own, at distancing oneself from others in preparing to commit serious violence, one is thereby and to that extent morally harming oneself. One does so precisely by compromising one's own ability to recognize the humanity in others, thereby undermining one's capacity for empathic concern. **A** reduced capacity for empathic concern **will affect** allsorts of other-regarding virtues, **since they** depend on perceiving **the other as a fellow human.**

# Underviews:

## Theory:

#### First, Theory is an RVI for the aff – if I win no abuse or offense to a counter-interp, I win the round.

#### a) Time Skew - theory moots the entirety of the aff, and exacerbates the 13-7 time skew and 7.3% neg side bias[[1]](#footnote-1). The 6-minute 2NR means they can go all in on substance and theory, giving the aff no chance to cover every layer in the 2A.

#### b) Reciprocity- they have more qualitative routes to the ballot. They can win substance or theory, whereas I have to win both in order to win. Neg always gets bidirectional theory, whereas the aff speaks in the dark so they have a structural advantage.

#### c) Education – disincentivizes theory for strategic reasons and promotes substantive discussion – either the debate collapses to theory and no education anyways, or theory is kicked and there’s a huge deficit to topical discussion.

#### Second, on T, drop the arg and re-evaluate my offense underneath the text of the resolution – (a) the aff goes blind into the round while the neg is reactive and has the ability to read bidirectional T while I don’t – outweighs on fairness because the neg has a structural advantage over the aff on theory debaters (b) it ensures that the neg only reads T when there is real abuse rather than just as a no-risk issue.

#### Third, on neg theory and T, use a reasonability paradigm with a bright line of in-round structural abuse defined as the denial of link turn ground – (a) there are multiple legitimate interpretations of the topic – I have to take a stance in the 1AC on one bidirectional issue, reasonability solves because it limits the neg from reading the other side of bidirectional T (b) any other form of abuse is subjectively good or bad i.e. some people think plans are good or bad, however, structural abuse creates tangible abuse and (c) substance skews are irresolvable due to outside factors like coaching, more prep, etc.

#### Fourth, Neg must explicitly propose word for word all T interpretations about my advocacy as well as meta-theoretical concerns and give me the chance to comply to prevent norm creation based on ambiguity and allow the aff to rectify possible abuse.

## K:

#### 1. A. Interpretation: The negative must accept the aff’s choice of paradigm choice that refers to the role of the ballot if the aff was disclosed on the wiki prior to the round. To clarify, the role of the ballot is truth testing.

#### B. Violation: You violate if you contest, re-contextualize the role of the ballot, or read T on the aff.

#### C. Standards:

#### Paradigm choice preserves all of the AC because I’m forced to speak first and define the starting point for the debate- role of the ballot contestations make the 1AC useless since it changes the question about what we are debating about. Also, switch side debate solves and turns their offense – when their AFF they can have APC – solves their abuse since APC forces debaters to explore role of the ballots by forcing them to debate under different conceptions of debate. This increases the best topical depth and clash by forcing discussion on one role of the ballot instead of debating how we should debate, which happens on every topic. Ground key to fairness and education since it’s my only access to the ballot and source of education. Disclosure uniquely solves because you had the ability to prep turns to the aff so this is a unique discussion to talk about.

#### Fairness is a voter because debate is a competition governed by rules otherwise there is no limits on debaters running abusive arguments. You don’t know if they are winning on that layer if that layer is unfair.

#### Aff theory is a reason to drop the debater because a) the time crunched 1ar is insufficient to win both theory and substance, so aff has no ability to check abuse leading to infinite harm, and b) the 2nr can collapse on aff theory making it impossible for the aff to cover all of the arguments in the three minute 2ar if they split their time with substance and theory

#### 2) The role of the ballot and judge is to vote for the debater who proves the truth or falsity of the resolution. Multiple Warrants – 1. Key to text- to negate[[2]](#footnote-2) means “to deny the existence or truth of,” so the most predictable distributions of burdens is truth and falsity since the text is all we have going into the round. 2. Jurisdiction: Enforcing a particular view of education is outside the judge’s jurisdiction because there it makes it impossible to check back judge intervention. Their interpretation makes the judge responsible for instilling some kind of critical education but that means the judge can just intervene against any argument in the name of education. But that makes the debate pointless since they can intervene against the debater who wins the flow, getting rid of any incentive for debaters to engage to debate, since they could lose no matter what they do.

1. Methodology at request. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. "negate." Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. 2010. Merriam-Webster Online. 18 August 2010. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)